

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejection raised in the Office action, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any portion of the Office Action not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Office noted that claims 1-14 are pending and rejected. Applicants previously canceled claims 15-21. In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance.

REJECTION

The Office rejected claims 1-5 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,527 issued to Worthington (hereon after "*Worthington*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0154116 published to Lofton (hereon after "*Lofton*"). The Office also rejected claims 6-7, 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,527 issued to Worthington (hereon after "*Worthington*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,527 issued to Lofton (hereon after "*Lofton*"), in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078752 published to Johnson Jr. (hereon after "*Johnson*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants submit that *Worthington* and *Lofton* teach away from each other. More specifically, *Lofton* discloses a "system and method for scheduling providing an Internet-based calendar for use by a number of people, where each user has a personal calendar with is associated with the user through user identification data to permit users to automatically receive updates of events which have been posted by one or more other users...." *Lofton*, at Abstract. According, *Lofton* specifically disclosing and the recited invention requires that a "coach, or first user, must register to become a user of the system." *Id.* at paragraph [0115]. Furthermore, *Worthington* discloses "In order to select any of the option buttons and proceed, a user must identify himself or herself by inputting with input means, preferably by

typing, the user's identification data, such as the user's e-mail address, and a password." *Id.* at paragraph [0092].

Worthington, on the other hand, discloses a "method and system for organizing and planning various categories of events, tasks and long-term goals. The method and system generally include of providing at least one data module for generating data for a specific topic area of events and tasks; prompting a user to provide data based on the specific topic area of the one data module; categorizing the data inputted by the user into appointment data and task data; inputting the appointment data into a calendar framework; inputting the task data into a task list framework; and generating an output calendar and task list based on the calendar and task list frameworks." *Worthington*, at Abstract. Furthermore, *Worthington* discloses a "data module 2 consists of a questionnaire-style system for collecting data... [which] is designed to collect data for a specific topic," *Id.* at Col. 3 Lines 62-66, and "some questions are not applicable to the individual user, those questions may simply be ignored; the user may input 15 data to indicate that the question is not applicable." *Id.* at Col. 6 Lines 13-16.

Therefore, Applicants submit that *Worthington* and *Lofton* teach away from each other. Accordingly, it is Applicant's opinion that *Worthington* and *Lofton*, alone and in combination, do not suggest or show a motivation for modifying the reference or to combine the reference teachings. In addition, it is Applicant's opinion that there is no evidence in any of the prior art that shows a "reasonable expectation of success" in combining the references. Thus, it is Applicant's belief that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been provided.

Applicants note that the Office cited *Worthington* and *Lofton* for the proposition that it teaches all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 8, from which the dependent claims 6-7 and 13-14 ultimately depend. The Applicants also note that the Office only cited *Johnson* with respect to the subject matter claimed in the dependent claims 6-7 and 13-14.

Given that each of the dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14 depend, directly or indirectly, from either independent amended claim 1 or 8, each necessarily includes all the elements of their respective independent claim. Since *Worthington* and *Lofton*, alone and in combination, do not teach all the elements of the independent claims 1 and 8 and since the Office only cited *Johnson* with respect to the subject matter claimed in the dependent claims 6-7 and 13-14, the Applicants, therefore,

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Office believes that any unresolved issues still exist or if, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite passing the present application to issue, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney directly at 972-917-4365 or the office of the undersigned attorney at 972-917-4363 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 29, 2009

By: /MIRNA ABYAD/
MIRNA ABYAD
Registration No. 58,615
Texas Instruments
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Telephone: (972) 917-4365